

[Mr. Chairman.]

return within ten days. But I had a sudden attack of abdominal colic on the 1st and was admitted to a nursing home on the 3rd. I got discharged on the 8th and I have been advised by the Doctor to take complete rest for a fortnight. Hence I would not be able to attend the present Session.

So, I request you to kindly grant me leave of absence from the 24th till the closing of the Session."

Is it the pleasure of the House that permission be granted to Dr. A Subba Rao for remaining absent from all meetings of the House during the current Session from 25th February?

No hon. Member dissented.

MR. CHAIRMAN: Permission to remain absent is granted.

STATEMENT RE CERTAIN INSTANCES OF MOB VIOLENCE AT KIRIBURU IRON ORE PROJECT SITE

THE DEPUTY MINISTER IN THE MINISTRY OF FINANCE (SHRI B. R. BHAGAT): Sir, with your permission, on behalf of the Minister of Mines and Fuel, I beg to lay on the Table the Statement regarding certain instances of mob violence at the Project site of Kiriburu Iron Ore Project of the National Mineral Development Corporation Ltd. [See Appendix XLII, Annexure No. 31.]

THE APPROPRIATION (VOTE ON ACCOUNT) BILL, 1963

THE DEPUTY MINISTER IN THE MINISTRY OF FINANCE (SHRI B. R. BHAGAT): Sir, I beg to move:

"That the Bill to provide for the withdrawal of certain sums from and out of the Consolidated Fund of India for the services of a part of

the financial year 1963-64, as passed by the Lok Sabha, be taken into consideration."

Sir, this Bill arises out of a sum of Rs. 2,47.06 crores voted by the Lok Sabha on the 16th March, 1963, in accordance with the provisions of article 116 of the Constitution and Rs. 7.71.42 crores in respect of expenditure 'charged' on the Consolidated Fund of India as shown in the 'Vote on Account' Statement which has already been circulated to hon. Members. As the House is aware, it is usual to seek the approval of Parliament for one month's supply pending the completion of the procedure for the voting of the Demands for Grants for the whole year and the passing of the connected Appropriation Bill. Accordingly provision has been made in the Bill to meet the estimated requirements for the month of April, 1963. These broadly represent one-twelfth of the whole year's gross requirements as provided for in the Demands for Grants except in a few cases where the expenditure is not uniformly spread over the year and larger provision is required to meet the likely payments next month. The items where larger provision is required have been detailed together with explanations of the reasons for the additional requirements in paragraph 4 of the Note to the Statement of 'Vote on Account'.

With these few words, Sir, I move.

The question was proposed.

MR. CHAIRMAN: Mr. Bhupesh Gupta, before you begin, I should like to point out that only one hour has been allotted in respect of this Bill and I hope in the interest of other Members you will be very brief.

SHRI BHUPESH GUPTA (West-Bengal): Certainly, Sir. Mr. Chairman, Sir, I would like to make only a few observations with regard to certain items in regard to this Bill. I do not want to go into the details but I will only make some brief reference to some items.

First of all, Sir, I would like to draw the attention of the House to the huge expenditure that we have earmarked for Defence. We cannot say how the money will be spent for the simple reason that we do not know what exactly the plans are. It is for the Government to consider which aspects of Defence are not to be disclosed for security reasons and which aspects can be disclosed to Parliament. I do not think it would be right for the Government to keep back from Parliament even those things that could easily be disclosed. In wartime in England there had always been a division of this kind—things that could be disclosed and things that could not be disclosed. But the British parliamentary practice is one, where they have, in normal peacetime, a maximum amount of factual information with regard to matters of Defence. After all, Sir, matters of Defence not only involve finances but they also involve questions of sovereignty and independence of the country and its security as such. Yesterday in this House the Defence Minister, in reply to the question relating to foreign defence aid to India, stated that "The Government of India will offer necessary facilities to the representatives of those two Governments, the U.K. Government and the U.S.A. Government attached to the staff of the British High Commission in India/Embassy of United States of America in India for the purpose of observing and reviewing the use of the arms and equipment and will provide them with such information as may be necessary for that purpose". Sir, when we asked what it actually meant, we could not get ourselves enlightened by the Minister. All that he said was that the officers would be there and technically it would be helpful. It is not clear as to why, when there is no military operation, these officers should be here to review our things. We were given to understand that they would not come to the operational fields. But operations do not take place all the time. What will happen when there are no operations? Are they to be here—the military personnel—in order

to supervise our conduct? Are we to wait on them for a good conduct certificate before we can ask for more arms or equipment on commercial terms and so on from other countries? This is a very legitimate question to be asked.

SHRI FARIDUL HAQ ANSARI (Uttar Pradesh): I am sorry to interrupt my friend. Is it the case of the hon. Member that during this period we should not prepare ourselves?

SHRI BHUPESH GUPTA: If Mr. Ansari wants to prepare the country with the Americans . . .

SHRI FARIDUL HAQ ANSARI: With Soviet Russia also.

SHRI BHUPESH GUPTA: . . . to fight our battle, he is welcome to do so. Fight your battle with the American guns and by putting in American hands. I am not one of those who would suggest that. I should like to fight our battle, Sir, if possible, with the weapons produced in our own country and certainly with our men and soldiers, our technicians and so on. If we cannot immediately produce everything that we require, certain things may be imported but no strings should be attached of a political nature and we should not allow any country any supervisory powers with regard to our conduct. It is a very serious matter, Sir. Of course, you can justify anything in the name of emergency but you should ponder over it. When we demanded of the United States of America that there should be a condition laid down that the weapons that were being given to Pakistan should not be used against India, up till now since the U.S. Pakistan military pact was signed, we have not got these conditions either from Pakistan or from the United States of America. Now, mind you, plenty of arms have been given to Pakistan but Pakistan has not even submitted to the condition that they will not use these arms against us in their various agreements either openly

[Shri Bhupesh Gupta.]

done or even secret protocols, and so on. It is a very serious thing that we are allowing. But what have we got? It is well-known from the Press that so far the bill for arms and equipment supplied comes to about Rs. 12 crores and our ordnance factories produce every month Rs. 7 crores worth of armaments. Therefore, we have not got very much by way of equipment, if you take the money value of it. We do not know exactly what other things we have got, but it is a very serious matter. To the last question, in the last reply he gave, Mr. Chavan said that they would supervise whether the arms were being used against China or somebody else. In the first place, it is casting reflections and suspicions on us. With all our protestations in the speeches that we make, the Americans are not satisfied as to the manner in which the arms are going to be used. They have to supervise it. Up till now they have not said anything in regard to Pakistan. Either the Pakistan authorities or the American authorities in the Senate say that the American observers and technicians are there in order to see that the arms are not used against this or that country, whichever way you take it. Well, if this is not political string and political turn, I do not know what it means. I think it is an impingement on our sovereignty. I say it is an impingement on our dignity. It is an impingement on our honour and self-respect. Get arms from wherever you can on commercial terms without compromising an iota of our independence, sovereignty and self-respect. It is for us to decide, for the Government of India, for Parliament to decide exactly in what manner against whom and in what circumstances the weapons are to be used. We do not need to be chaperoned in this matter or supervised in this matter. I am very sorry that it is not understood today. Mr. Chairman, in all humility, despite the impact of emergency, I appeal to you and the country today and through you to the Prime Minister

that our stature and glory have risen in the country directly as we have assumed the policy of true non-alignment, the policy of no capitulation in such matters which impinge on or affect adversely our independence and sovereignty. Now, today if we do such a thing, it would be a sad day for our country for our future. It will tarnish our fair name in the entire freedom-loving world where men are striving for independence and peace, looking forward to this great country of 400 millions for help and assistance or comradeship in such a great struggle. Therefore, I say this is wrong.

The next point that I would like to make here is this. I would invite your attention to what had appeared in the "Baltimore Sun" of 12th March. This is what the paper wrote:

"The administration takes the view that India has, in fact, become an active front in the cold war as one White House Assistant put it."

Now, they are talking of India in terms of cold war front. Who says it? A White House Assistant says it. I think that should be taken note of. In this connection, a circular letter issued by the United States Information Service, Delhi, on 20th December should also be brought to the notice of the House. It is most objectionable. They tell us how we should settle the Kashmir issue. The suggestion is that this should be surrendered to Pakistan. The only honourable course and reasonable course would be to give away the Kashmir valley. Now, the Government has said that this letter is objectionable in many ways, but this is what is happening.

The next point I would like to make in this connection is that we did not quite appreciate that when our leaders, representatives, Mr. Swaran Singh and others, were talking to the Pakistan representatives in Calcutta, the American Ambassador went all the way to Calcutta to be available for consultation.

SHRI DIBAKAR PATNAIK (Orissa):
How is it relevant here?

SHRI BHUPESH GUPTA: It is relevant.

SHRI A. D. MANI (Madhya Pradesh): On a point of order . . .

MR. CHAIRMAN: What is your point of order?

SHRI A. D. MANI: Sir, on a point of order. We have got one hour allotted for this. When is he finishing?

SHRI BHUPESH GUPTA: I am finishing. How many want to speak?

MR. CHAIRMAN: Please do not anticipate.

SHRI BHUPESH GUPTA: How many speakers have you got on the list?

MR. CHAIRMAN: I have got enough to ask you to sit down now, in two minutes.

SHRI BHUPESH GUPTA: Then, you please say how many speakers you have got.

MR. CHAIRMAN: I will not say it.

SHRI BHUPESH GUPTA: I am prepared to concede. Now, whatever few minutes you have taken on the point of order should be counted. It is not fair.

MR. CHAIRMAN: I will give you another two minutes.

SHRI BHUPESH GUPTA: Now, I cannot finish in two minutes. You have to chuck me out of the House also. All I say is I was going to finish. Then the point of order was raised and I accepted it. You said I have two minutes and then you take away two minutes like this.

MR. CHAIRMAN: Do not waste your time.

SHRI BHUPESH GUPTA: Then, curtail it. What is the time I have?

MR. CHAIRMAN: I am giving you fifteen minutes. I have four speakers already on the list.

SHRI BHUPESH GUPTA: All right, I was finishing. This interruption, the point of order came. The moment I mention America, the point of order comes and I am not going to yield to such things.

MR. CHAIRMAN: It is very uncharitable to impute motives to a person raising points of order. Please carry on.

SHRI BHUPESH GUPTA: It is not a question of that. It is disturbance in the speech, interference in the internal affairs of Members of Parliament.

MR. CHAIRMAN: It is something which you also do.

SHRI BHUPESH GUPTA: Let them fight it back. Now, since you are also saying such things I take your guidance in this matter and I finish it, but not in a very happy mood. I will cut out many things. I want only to point out this here. Just a minute, I do not know when you are going to chuck me out. The whole being has been spoiled by these interruptions.

MR. CHAIRMAN: I will not count this in your time. Look for your papers.

SHRI BHUPESH GUPTA: It is all right. I have got it now. I would invite your attention to a point about the emergency. Yesterday in the Chandigarh Assembly, Mr. Kairon said:

"We are prepared not only to release the Communists but garland them . . ."

How generous he is, waiting such garlands:

" . . . provided they declare that they are enemies of China."

Now, he is a responsible Chief Minister talking like it. The Prime Minister is telling the country that India

[Shri Bhupesh Gupta.]

is not an enemy of China. Indian people are not enemies of the people of China. Our quarrel is with the Government. The Chief Minister of that State need not wait with garlands. They do not want to be garlanded, but he should listen to the Prime Minister's advice. As far as the Chinese Government is concerned, our policy is opposed to that Government on the border question. It is well-known and the Punjab Communists are also opposed to it. We do not want his garlands, but let him release them instead of indulging in such demagoguery. In this connection, I would like to say only one more thing and then I end. On the 18th day before yesterday, there was a *habeas corpus* petition filed by Mr. Harnam Singh Chamak, M.L.A. There, the Punjab High Court has observed this. After hearing both sides His Lordship observed that under the law it was the satisfaction of the Government which mattered. If it had been satisfaction of the Court, the result might have been different. He would have been released. This is where we lost.

The last point I wish to say is this, because I have cut out everything. Day before yesterday, in another place I can quote it, the leader, the spokesman of P.S.P., speaking, in the foreign affairs debate referred to the "World Marxist Review" and wanted to make out, if I remember aright, and in quoting his words he said that in its latest issue it is said that this is a reactionary Government—the Indian Government—and it has a reactionary Prime Minister. Thereby he wanted to provoke Congressmen against Communists. It is a style of anti-communism. I have got hold of a copy of the "World Marxist Review" in which this article appears: "Lawlessness in India—Arrests of Communists Continue". This issue is February, 1963. In four places the name of the Prime Minister occurs. Nowhere the Prime Minister is called a reactionary and nowhere the Government is called reactionary. Yet the privilege of Parliament or advantage is taken of in

his speech in order to provoke these people. Only they say:

"This crude violation of civil liberties lends a grim irony to the statement made last September in London by Prime Minister Nehru. If one compares India with other areas of Asia, he said, one can see that the tendency in the latter is to restrict democracy whereas in India democracy is being encouraged and extended in every way."

Whatever it is, the paper humbly points out that what is happening in India is that the arrest of Communists in large numbers is not in keeping with the statement that the Prime Minister has made. The next point the paper makes is that the Prime Minister should realise that by arresting Communists and attacking them, his Government is only helping objectively the forces of reaction which are assailing his own policy. Now, it was very unfair of the spokesman of the P.S.P. to have misquoted and misused it in this manner and distorted this thing.

SHRI CHANDRA SHEKHAR (Uttar Pradesh): Since Mr. Bhupesh Gupta is asserting this point that the quotation given by the hon. Member in the other House is wrong, will he be ready to take the responsibility if that quotation is correct because he is insinuating against a Member who is not present here? And if there is any such quotation will the Hon. Member be held responsible for misquoting the book?

SHRI BHUPESH GUPTA: I shall give my head on a charger to Mr. Chandra Shekhar . . .

SHRI C. D. PANDE (Uttar Pradesh): Sir, is it necessary, while speaking on the Appropriation Bill, to defend Chinese policy in this House?

SHRI BHUPESH GUPTA: We are not defending Chinese policy.

SHRI C. D. PANDE: What else are you doing?

SHRI BHUPESH GUPTA: Do you call it relevant interruption. Sir, ...

MR. CHAIRMAN: Please sit down. You have finished your speech. Shri Pannalal Saraogi.

SHRI PANNALAL SARAOGI (West Bengal): Mr. Chairman, Sir, I rise to support the Appropriation (Vote on Account) Bill, 1963 which provides for the withdrawal of certain sums from and out of the Consolidated Fund of India for the services of a part of the financial year 1963-64. Sir, this House as well as the other House have discussed in detail the massive Budget proposals of the Finance Minister and hon. Members of both the Houses have made observations and offered their comments on these Budget proposals in a detailed manner. One of the controversial proposals of the Finance Minister has been the levy of the super profits-tax. Various types of suggestions and comments have been pouring in from all parts of India about the levy of this tax. I, in the next few minutes, would like to offer a very innocuous suggestion which, if accepted by the Government, would take away the sting out of the criticism that has been made so far; in addition it will serve the purpose of the Government in getting the much-needed revenue which the Finance Minister has estimated, namely about Rs. 25 crores out of this levy. I personally think that, if my suggestion is accepted, the Government will be able to get easily about Rs. 40 crores; in addition the criticisms which have been made, in this connection, will be by and large met.

Sir, I would like to suggest that the Government should put a surcharge of 10 per cent. on the existing levy of income-tax and super-tax amounting to 50 per cent. on all companies. The exchequer expects to derive an income of about Rs. 200 crores to Rs. 225 crores from the 50 per cent.

taxation on companies and this 10 per cent. surcharge of income-tax and super tax will yield to the Government an income of something like between Rs. 20 and Rs. 23 crores.

I would also submit that this surcharge should go exclusively to the Central Government and not be apportioned to the different States. This should be kept by the Central Government for meeting the defence needs of the country. I would like to mention in this connection that the major criticism which the people in the country are making against the super profits-tax is that it is going to hamper and retard the progress of expansion and development, that the purpose for which it is levied will be defeated. We all feel that development is defence, and if development is retarded ...

SHRI SHEEL BHADRA YAJEE (Bihar): It is the view of the capitalists.

SHRI PANNALAL SARAOGI: I am going to support the Government. We all know, Sir, that development is defence and if anything is done which will, even in a remote way, retard development, it will retard defence. This thing should be examined very carefully.

Sir, what I was proposing was that a 10 per cent. surcharge would immediately give to the Government something between Rs. 20 and 23 crores. The super profits-tax should also remain but in a modified form. Under the present proposal the super profits-tax is aimed to be levied after allowing 6 per cent. net return on the paid-up capital and reserves of a company. I would submit that this 6 per cent. should be raised to 10 per cent. And I am sure that if 10 per cent. net return is allowed to every company, it will by and large meet the criticism which is being levelled in this connection, and the Government will be getting another Rs. 15 crores on that account, and both the levies together—surcharge on income-tax and super-tax

[Shri Pannalal Saraogi.]
as well as super profits-tax in a modified form will yield to the Government about Rs. 40 crores which will be more than what the Finance Minister requests.

SHRI AKBAR ALI KHAN (Andhra Pradesh): Even the business houses have claimed only 9 per cent. and not 10 per cent.

SHRI PANNALAL SARAOGI: I am asking for this . . .

MR. CHAIRMAN: The House is interested in hearing what you are saying.

SHRI PANNALAL SARAOGI: I am sorry. I have already suggested that a surcharge of 10 per cent. should be levied on all the companies. That will bring a sizeable income, an appreciable revenue to the Government. Then I am going to suggest that if a company has got to pay more by way of surcharge and less by way of excess profits-tax, they should pay whichever is higher. Over and above the surcharge, if a company has to pay super profits-tax under my new suggestion, it will have to pay both. This is my only submission and I am sure the hon. Finance Minister will take into consideration my suggestions.

SHRI M. S. GURUPADA SWAMY (Mysore): Mr. Chairman, Sir, I would not like to traverse the same ground on the Budget as my friend Mr. Bhupesh Gupta did. But, in this connection, I would like to raise one or two relative issues which are going to have some effect on the defence effort.

Sir, when the Budget was discussed, I raised one important point, that is, about the creation of the capacity in the country for producing various types of things, various types of ammunition. The important point that I would like to raise now is whether after getting the approval of Parliament to meet the defence needs of the Budget which is now planned by the

Government, it would be within the capacity of the power of the Government to utilise this large amount for defence purposes.

Sir, as you are aware, we are having this year a Defence budget of Rs. 865 crores, and this Vote on Account Bill is a part of this Budget. Since some time past I have been receiving reports saying that the Government has not been able to move forward in the direction of defence effort adequately and effectively. There is no effort made to assess the defence potentialities in the various industries including the industries in the private sector. There have been complaints and complaints that various factories, both in the public sector and the private sector, have not done any budgeting of their potential and that the Government is not aware of the capacities that are available already, or of the new capacities that have got to be created in case the existing capacities are not adequate. Therefore, I would like to know whether any steps have been taken by the Government to assess the capacity already existing in the various sectors of industries, as well as the new capacities that are to be created to meet the recent defence demands.

Now, Sir, I learn that the ordnance factories which are working already are very outworn and old. Some of the equipment in these factories is as old as twenty-five years. As you know, Sir, the older the equipment the less will be the production and also the quality of the product will not be very satisfactory. Therefore, I would like to know what steps are being taken by the Defence Ministry in renovating, improving and modernising the ordnance factories. Today I read in the papers a disquieting thing. Considering that the ordnance factories have full capacity, unfortunately they have been lagging behind in producing tractors and trucks, and it is a very lamentable lacuma or drawback which has been found. After a huge effort is made, after the proper climate is

created in the country for the defence effort, we find today that no sufficient effort is made to utilise the existing capacities in these ordnance factories even for producing those things which have already been planned for. Therefore, it is a sad commentary on the defence effort of our Government.

Then I would like to know what progress has been made in regard to MIGs. We read in the papers and we heard also from the Prime Minister the other day that four MIGs have already arrived, but no news seems to have come after that. I do not know what progress has been made in regard to the setting up of a MIG factory in India, whether the plan is approved, whether the agreement has been signed and what is the schedule of time for putting up this factory in India. I would like to know some of these things about the MIGs.

Then, Sir, a reference was made the other day about the prisoners of war in China. There are about 3,000 prisoners of war, and we do not seem to have taken any steps to recover these prisoners of war. Those who have fought for India, fought for the defence of the country, to save our honour and respect, those people are there in China. I do not think that any effort has been made at any level to recover these prisoners of war. I would like to know and the House would also be anxious to know what steps are being taken to recover these prisoners of war. According to us, unless these prisoners of war who fought for the country are recovered in time there is no use in talking about the Colombo Proposals, clarifications in the acceptance of these proposals, and the like. Unless this important matter is cleared, it would be difficult for the Government to convince the people that the Government is very serious in regard to this matter. Therefore, I would like to know from the Minister whether any steps have been taken in this regard to recover the prisoners of war from China. I would not like this matter to be handled entirely by

the Red Cross, but it should be handled at the Government level. Therefore, Sir, I would like some information in this regard.

Then in regard to the issue raised by Mr. Bhupesh Gupta, I did not like to interrupt him at that time when he was speaking about the speech made by our friend in the other House in regard to the 'World Marxist Review', the characterisation of the Government as reactionary and the like. Sir, this is the February issue of the 'Review'. I do not know whether that is the issue that was referred to by my hon. friend, Mr. Nath Pai, there. It would have been proper for Mr. Bhupesh Gupta to have contacted him before he came before the House to make such remarks about him. I would advise him to contact Mr. Nath Pai. He is the person who made the statement in the other House, and if there is justification for that statement Mr. Bhupesh Gupta should accept the responsibility and withdraw all the remarks that he has made today.

MR. CHAIRMAN: It is a hypothetical statement.

SHRI M. S. GURUPADA SWAMY: I am pointing out that that is for verification. Lastly, I would like to say something about this booklet, my colleague, Mr. Chandra Shekhar, has brought to me this thing.

SHRI BHUPESH GUPTA: Supplied by me, you see. I am a sportsman as such.

SHRI M. S. GURUPADA SWAMY: Here is a relevant sentence. A few sentences I would like to bring to the notice of the House—page 88 of the 'World Marxist Review':

"Many active trade unionists and union officials have been arrested. The Indian National Trade Union Congress connected with the Congress Party is taking advantage of the situation to undermine and, if possible, to destroy

c [Shri M. S. Gurupada Swamy.]
the influence of the All India Trade Union Congress among the working class. Many of the arrests have been made at the instigation of the I.N.T.U.C. leaders and the employers."

Then it goes on to say:

"In the light of all this how can any one say that in India democracy is being encouraged and extended in every way? What price the Prime Minister's New Year's assurances that the national emergency would not affect democratic institutions."

(Interruption)

Then it goes on to say one more thing:

"Prime Minister Nehru has tried to shift the responsibility for the repressive measures taken against patriots to the State Governments."

(Interruption)

SHRI BHUPESH GUPTA: Sir, on a point of order.

SHRI K. L. NARASIMHAM (Andhra Pradesh): We have been silent and he has been saying all those things. If we allow these things . . .

MR. CHAIRMAN: I have allowed Mr. Bhupesh Gupta to raise his point of order.

SHRI BHUPESH GUPTA: The only point of order is, since the hon. Member is replying to what I have said, he should keep to this. He can say other things also, I do not mind. I said that it was wrong for the P.S.P. Member to have said that the 'World Marxist Review' calls Nehru a reactionary and Nehru Government a reactionary Government. Nowhere does it occur. If he can prove it, I will go in sackcloth and, ashes . . .

MR. CHAIRMAN: What is your point of order?

SHRI BHUPESH GUPTA: The point of order is this. In the name of replying to what I have said, such digression should not be allowed. He can do it on his own. He might read the entire article, you give him some time.

MR. CHAIRMAN: If this is so, the reply would be ineffective. But he is entitled to reply.

SHRI M. S. GURUPADA SWAMY: I will just quote one sentence, and I do not like to dilate upon this further.

"Prime Minister Nehru has tried to shift the responsibility for the repressive measures taken against patriots to the State Governments; conceding that not all the arrests were warranted and promising that the cases of a number of arrested Communists would be re-examined, to throw dust in the eyes of the public this has been done in some cases."

It goes on like that.

MR. CHAIRMAN: It does not say that the Prime Minister is reactionary. It is only by remote implication.

SHRI M. S. GURUPADA SWAMY: The whole writing shows the character . . .

SHRI BHUPESH GUPTA: I have just given it to him, those quotations I have marked.

SHRI M. S. GURUPADA SWAMY: I have taken the sentences he has marked. These sentences are enough to prove the character of the writing itself. But I do not like to go further on this point. I do not like to have any quarrel with Mr. Bhupesh Gupta, but I would like to urge upon the Government to take note of the new tactics that is being adopted by the Communist friends, the new tactics symbolised by Mr. Bhupesh Gupta. This has to be taken note of, and I would urge upon the Government to bestow their thoughts on some of the new techniques being adopted by the

Communist Party of India. The most important technique is to isolate the Prime Minister, to treat him well, and to criticise the rest. That has been the new tactics that had been made use of by my colleague the other day. This should be taken note of.

Lastly, I do not want to criticise the Bill; it is part of the defence effort and I support it. But I would like to know whether the funds that are going to be sanctioned by us now and hereafter would be adequately used, properly and effectively used for these efforts, and whether we have got the necessary apparatus, necessary machinery or necessary facilities for utilising these funds approved by Parliament in the most effective manner which we all desire. Thank you very much.

SHRI BHUPESH GUPTA: Sir, may I have that with your permission?

MR. CHAIRMAN: He wants the magazine back.

SHRI BHUPESH GUPTA: It does not lead to the improvement of the situation anyway.

श्री ए० बी० वाजपेयी (उत्तर प्रदेश) : सभापति जी, इस विधेयक पर मुझे कुछ कहने की इच्छा नहीं थी लेकिन मेरे मित्र जो दायीं ओर बैठते हैं और दावा करते हैं कि वह बायीं ओर चलते हैं उन्होंने मुझे कुछ कहने के लिये उत्तेजित किया है।

श्री नोरेन घोष (पश्चिमी बंगाल) : वह बायीं ओर बैठते हैं और दायीं ओर चलने का दावा करते हैं।

श्री ए० बी० वाजपेयी : मैं समझता हूँ कि देश की सुरक्षा होनी चाहिए—ऐसा कम्युनिस्ट पार्टी का भी

उद्घोषित उद्देश्य है लेकिन यह सुरक्षा किस प्रकार से होगी इस के सम्बन्ध में उन्होंने कुछ विचार प्रकट किये। स्वाधीनता के बाद अन्तर्राष्ट्रीय क्षेत्र में हम ने दोनों शक्ति-गुटों से अलग रहने की नीति अपनाई थी हम किसी भी सैनिक गठबंधन में नहीं बंधे थे और आज भी हम किसी सैनिक-शक्ति के साथ अगने को जोड़ना नहीं चाहते लेकिन यदि अपनी इस स्थिति पर हमें किसी ने पुनर्विचार करने के लिये विवश किया है तो कम्युनिस्ट चीन ने। कम्युनिस्ट चीन ने भारत पर खुला आक्रमण कर के हमें मजबूर किया है कि हम दूसरे देशों से सैनिक सहायता प्राप्त करें। हम सोवियत रूस से सैनिक सहायता लेना चाहते हैं किन्तु वह इस स्थिति में नहीं है कि जितनी सहायता हमें आवश्यक है उतनी सहायता दे सके। तो क्या इसका अर्थ यह है कि हम अमेरिका से सहायता न लें और अपनी सुरक्षा को भविष्य के भरोसे छोड़ दें ?

प्रधान मंत्री जी कहने हैं कि चीन पुनः आक्रमण करेगा। अगर हमारे मित्र यह आश्वासन दिला सकें कि चीन तब तक हमला नहीं करेगा जब तक भारत सुरक्षा की दृष्टि से आत्मनिर्भर नहीं हो जाता तो मैं इस सदन में कहने के लिये तैयार हूँ कि हमें अमेरिका से शस्त्रास्त्र नहीं लेना चाहिये। हम पिछले १५ वर्ष में अमेरिका के पास हथियार लेने के लिये नहीं गये। मैं कल्पना कर सकता हूँ कि हमारे प्रधान मंत्री जी जो पिछले १५ साल तक निरन्तर हथियार लेने का विरोध करते रहे आज किसी मजबूरी से हथियार लेने के लिये तैयार हुए—यह दुर्दिन हमें अगर देखना पड़ा है तो कम्युनिस्ट चीन के हमले की वजह से देखना पड़ा है और जब तक यह हमला तब तक हमें जहाँ से

[श्री ए० बी० वाजपेयी]

हथियार मिलेंगे लेना चाहिये । सोवियत रूस ने भी अपनी रक्षा के लिये अमेरिका से हथियार लिये थे—तब सोवियत रूस अमेरिकी-गुट में नहीं चला गया । हमारे मित्र को आपत्ति है कि हमने यह आश्वासन क्यों दिया है कि हम इन हथियारों को पाकिस्तान के खिलाफ काम में नहीं लायेंगे । यह आश्वासन इसलिये दिया है कि हम यह हथियार पाकिस्तान के खिलाफ काम में कभी लाना नहीं चाहते ।

SHRI BHUPESH GUPTA: I did not say that. You know what I said. I quite follow your speech.

श्री ए० बी० वाजपेयी : मैं कहना चाहता हूँ कि हमारे मित्र ने जो उद्धरण पढ़ कर सुनाया सुरक्षा मंत्री के कल दिये गये उत्तर का उस में आश्वासन का अर्थ यही है कि जो हथियार हमें चीन में लड़ने के लिए मिल रहे हैं वह हम पाकिस्तान के खिलाफ काम में नहीं लायेंगे । यह अमेरिका की खुली शर्त है और यह शर्त हम ने मानी है क्योंकि पाकिस्तान के प्रति हमारे मन में दुर्भावना नहीं है, हम पाकिस्तान पर कभी हमला नहीं करना चाहते हैं । अगर कम्युनिस्ट पार्टी के इस बारे में विचार अलग है तो उन्हें साफ साफ कहना चाहिये मगर वह साफ साफ नहीं कहते . . .

श्री सी० डी० पांडे : कभी नहीं कहेंगे ।

श्री ए० बी० वाजपेयी : . . . और अमेरिका को जो आश्वासन दिया है उसका बहाना बना कर . . .

SHRI BHUPESH GUPTA: Read what I have said.

श्री ए० बी० वाजपेयी : . . . उसका बहाना बना कर वह हमें सैनिक सहायता प्राप्त करनेसे रोकना चाहते हैं । वह जानते

हैं कि रूस तो सहायता दे नहीं सकता—रूस से मिलने वाले चार भिग विमानों को लेकर हम चान के तीन हजार भिग विमानों का सामना नहीं कर सकते, लेकिन कम्युनिस्ट पार्टी का उद्देश्य है कि भारत दुर्बल रहे जिससे कि आगे जाकर जब कभी चीन हमला करे तो भारत उस हमले का सामना नहीं कर सके . . .

SHRI BHUPESH GUPTA: This is entirely wrong. The Member should not have made that statement.

SHRI C. D. PANDE: What else do you want?

श्री ए० बी० वाजपेयी : . . . अन्यथा अमेरिका से मिलने वाली सैनिक सहायता पर कम्युनिस्ट पार्टी को कोई आपत्ति नहीं होना चाहिये । कम्युनिस्ट नेता भी जानते हैं कि हमने किसी भी गुट में शामिल होने का फैसला नहीं किया है—वह अपने और कम्युनिस्ट देशों से कह सकते हैं, चेकोस्लोवाकिया से, पोलैंड से, कि हमें आज जो सैनिक सहायता चाहिये उसे वह दें, लेकिन कम्युनिस्ट देश हमें सहायता न दें और अन्य देशों से हमें सहायता लेने से रोकें, इस स्थिति को हम बर्दाश्त करने को तैयार नहीं हैं । अगर कम्युनिस्ट पार्टी आज यह नारा लगाती है कि हम गटबन्धन में, गुटबन्दा में, शामिल हो रहे हैं तो मैं पूछना चाहता हूँ कि क्या कम्युनिस्ट पार्टी सचमुच में गुटबन्दा से अलग रहने की नीति पर विश्वास करती है—क्या कामरेड भूपेश गुप्त को खुशी नहीं होगी अगर हम सोवियत रूस से मिलने का फैसला कर लें ? आज वह इस सवाल का जवाब दें ।

SHRI BHUPESH GUPTA: You finish.

श्री ए० बी० वाजपेयी : मैं उनको चुनौती देता हूँ वह इसका जवाब दें ।

SHRI C. D. PANDE: He cannot.

SHRI BHUPESH GUPTA: What is that?

SHRI NIREN GHOSH: He is speaking as in Washington.

श्री ए० बी० वाजपेयी : मैं उनको दावत दे रहा हूँ, वह अपनी स्थिति स्पष्ट करें। वह यह कहते हैं कि वह नहीं चाहते कि हम अमेरिकी गुट में मिलें, हम भी नहीं चाहते मगर वह अपने दिल में यह चाहते हैं या नहीं कि. . .

SHRI BHUPESH GUPTA: I will answer that. Don't get excited. Sir, I want India to remain non-aligned, either with the Soviet bloc or with the American bloc, despite Shri Vajpayee's ploddings to the American camp, and I hope that the Prime Minister will do so and I have faith that he will do so.

श्री ए० बी० वाजपेयी : जो उन्होंने उत्तर दिया है वह कम्युनिस्ट पार्टी की नीति के अनुसार है।

SHRI BHUPESH GUPTA: Shall I answer?

श्री ए० बी० वाजपेयी : मैंने यह प्रश्न पूछा था कि अगर हम रूसी गुट में शामिल हो गये तो कामरेड भूपेश गुप्त को खुशी होगी या नहीं? इसका उन्होंने उत्तर नहीं दिया।

SHRI BHUPESH GUPTA: No. What I want to say is this. Obviously, what I am saying I am saying. I shall be happy only if this policy of non-alignment continues. This is what my line is. I do not know . . .

(Interruptions).

SHRI A. B. VAJPAYEE: It is not a positive reply.

SHRI BHUPESH GUPTA: Now, what do you want? Will you put it?

MR. CHAIRMAN: He wants to know if you would be happy if India . . .

SHRI BHUPESH GUPTA: I am happy as it is. I will be happier if

the policy of non-alignment continues and gets strengthened. I will be still more happy if Shri Vajpayee gives up his present policy.

SHRI A. B. VAJPAYEE: He will be the happiest man if India decides to join the Soviet bloc.

SHRI BHUPESH GUPTA: If Shri Vajpayee's policy on foreign affairs is buried ten fathoms deep, it would be the happiest day in my life.

MR. CHAIRMAN: Mr. Vajpayee, it is not a very fruitful line that you are taking.

SHRI BHUPESH GUPTA: He has got into the wrong boot.

श्री ए० बी० वाजपेयी : अच्छा, सभापति जी, मैं इस बात को यही समाप्त करता हूँ।

दूसरी बात जो मैं आपके सामने लाना चाहता हूँ वह यह है कि कुछ दिनों से देश में ऊँचे क्षेत्रों में जो भ्रष्टाचार विद्यमान है उसकी चर्चा हो रही है—केन्द्र के और प्रान्त के मंत्रियों के भी नाम लिये जा रहे हैं मैं समझता हूँ समय आ गया है कि अब भूतपूर्व वित्त मंत्री श्री सी० डी० देशमुख के इस मुद्दाव को अपनाया जाय कि मंत्रियों के संबंध में भ्रष्टाचार के जो आरोप लगाये जाते हैं उनकी जांच के लिये एक उच्चाधिकार सम्पन्न आयोग बनना चाहिये। प्रधान मंत्री जी ने उस मुद्दाव को उस समय स्वीकार नहीं किया लेकिन कुछ दिनों से ये बातें बल पकड़ रही हैं। उद्योगपतियों में, पूँजीपतियों में, जो भ्रष्टाचार व्याप्त है उसे भी राजनैतिक भ्रष्टाचार से अलग नहीं किया जा सकता। केन्द्र के एक मंत्री हैं जो नई दिल्ली से प्रकाशित होने वाले एक दैनिक अखबार को लिये सारे देश में रुपये इकट्ठे कर रहे हैं।

شہری فریدالحق انصاری : کونسے

اخبار کے لئے ؟

†[श्री फरीदुल हक अन्तारी : कौन से अब्बार के लिये ?]

श्री ए० बी० वाजपेयी : स्पष्ट है कि यह रुपया गरीबों में इकट्ठा नहीं किया जा रहा है, यह पूँजापतियों से, उद्योगपतियों से इकट्ठा किया जा रहा है। क्या यह मंत्रिपद का दुरुपयोग नहीं है ? क्या यह भ्रष्टाचार के अन्तर्गत नहीं आता ? अगर प्रधान मंत्री जी इसकी जाँच कराना चाहें तो मैं उनके सामने कुछ प्रमाण रखने को तैयार हूँ। कोई मंत्री किसी दैनिक पत्र के लिये रुपया इकट्ठा करे—यह तो लोकतंत्र परम्पराओं के अनुसार ठीक नहीं है, मगर ऐसा किया जा रहा है इसलिये मैं निवेदन करूँगा कि शासन इस बात पर गम्भीरता से विचार करे कि क्या अब समय नहीं आ गया है जबकि उच्च क्षेत्रों में विद्यमान भ्रष्टाचार की जाँच के लिये एक उच्चाधिकार आयोग नियुक्त किया जाय।

मैं एक बात कह कर समाप्त कर दूँगा। बजट पर दूसरे सदन में जो बहस हुई है उसमें हमारे भूतपूर्व सुरक्षा मंत्रों ने भी भाषण दिया। मैं उनके भाषण के एक अंश की ओर आपका ध्यान खींचना चाहता हूँ। उन्होंने कहा कि ऊँचे अफसरों को छोड़कर सुरक्षा सेवाओं में जो भी लोग काम करते हैं उन्हें टैक्सों से बरी किया जाना चाहिये। मैं समझता हूँ, जब वे मंत्रिमंडल में थे तब उन्होंने यह सुझाव सरकार के सामने रखा होगा और उनकी यह बात अभी तक मानी नहीं गई। इससे स्पष्ट है कि शासन ने वह सुझाव ठुकरा दिया। तो क्या मंत्रिमंडल से अलग होते ही उनके लिये यह उचित था कि सदन में इस तरह का सुझाव सार्वजनिक रूप से रखते ? वे प्रधान मंत्री जी से यह बात कह सकते थे, वित्त मंत्री जी तक अपना यह सुझाव पहुँचा सकते थे। अब अगर वित्त मंत्री या शासन इस सुझाव को नहीं मानेगा तो क्या सेना में यह असर नहीं होगा कि उनके पुराने सुरक्षा मंत्रों तो उन्हें टैक्सों से बरी रखना चाहते

हैं मगर वर्तमान मंत्रिमंडल उन पर टैक्स लादना चाहता है ? क्या यह सेना की निष्ठा को ढिगाने वाली बात नहीं होगी ? पुराने सुरक्षा मंत्रों पर यह आरोप लगाये जा चुके हैं कि वे सेना में राजनीति को घुसेड़ना चाहते थे और इस प्रकार का भाषण देकर उन्होंने इस आरोप की पुष्टि कर दी है। मैं चाहूँगा, वित्त मंत्री इस संबंध में शासन की स्थिति को स्पष्ट करे और प्रधान मंत्री जी इस बात पर विचार करें कि क्या एक भूतपूर्व सुरक्षा मंत्रों के लिये मंत्रिमंडल से अलग होते ही ऐसा सुझाव रखना सेना की निष्ठा बनाये रखने के लिये, सेना के अनुशासन को बनाये रखने के लिये ठीक है ? यह एक गम्भीर प्रश्न है जिसकी उपेक्षा नहीं की जानी चाहिये।
धन्यवाद

SHRI B. R. BHAGAT: Mr. Chairman, Sir, the hon. Members have indulged in arguments and cross arguments about each other and have left nothing for me to reply. Therefore I do not propose to complicate their arguments and cross arguments by my own.

The hon. Member, he had made a suggestion about the super profits-tax. Other suggestions have also been made, and certainly the Finance Minister will bear them in mind—it is not for me to say anything about them.

Then the hon. Member, Mr. Gurupada Swamy, said that the House will grant the funds but the Government should see that the funds are utilised properly. That is the main burden of this; it is the duty of the Government and Parliament to see that not only the funds are utilised for the purposes for which Parliament sanctions them but also every effort should be made to economise and bring the utmost efficiency in the administration. It is a continuing process and no cut and dried solutions can be given or made in this. But I can assure the hon. Member and through you the House that the Government has been keen on economising and preventing any wast-

ages; much more so these days when we have come to the Parliament for such a large sum of money it would be the effort that every pie is saved, that every pie is utilised in the best interests of the country and for the purposes for which they have been sanctioned.

With these words, Sir, I move.

MR. CHAIRMAN: The question is:

"That the Bill to provide for the withdrawal of certain sums from and out of the Consolidated Fund of India for the services of a part of the financial year 1963-64, as passed by the Lok Sabha, be taken into consideration."

The motion was adopted.

MR. CHAIRMAN: We shall now take up the clause by clause consideration of the Bill. There are no amendments.

Clauses 2 and 3 and the Schedule were added to the Bill.

Clause 1, the Enacting Formula and the Title were added to the Bill.

SHRI B. R. BHAGAT: Sir, I move:

"That the Bill be returned."

The question was proposed.

SHRI BHUPESH GUPTA: Sir, I need not go over what has been said by me already, but one thing I would like to say towards the end of this debate before we meet after the recess. No concessions whatsoever should be given to the bullying tactics and pressures and exhortations of big business. We have read in the papers that Mr. J. R. D. Tata, Mr. Arvind, Mr. Mafatlal and certain other gentlemen of the high finance met the Prime Minister to plead with him that the super profits-tax should be given up, if not given up, should be scaled down. They have been lobbying here meeting Members of Parliament, they have been meeting Ministers and others. We have apprehensions that

Government might yield to these pressures. We have not been given an indication in the Budget speeches that nothing will be done by way of giving any concessions to them. I think what is needed now really is to consider as to how the super profits-tax could be raised, because our calculation is this—based on the economic findings—that out of this tax we can gather not twenty-five but fifty crores of rupees. The Prime Minister's mind should be addressed to this task of raising Rs. 50 crores instead of Rs. 25 crores, and the Finance Minister should not waste his time in receiving delegations of Mr. Tata and others but work out as to how more could be found out by amending the Finance Bill. Wherever you go in Delhi, you hear the same thing—deputations and delegations waiting upon Ministers and influential Members of Parliament belonging to the Congress Party and trying to impress upon them that imposition of the present scale of super profits-tax would be a disincentive to industry, that development will be retarded, that expansion of industrialisation will not take place and so on. These are all moonshine talk. It is all said from their angle and we will not be carried away by it. For us these are wrong and illogical arguments. I think, Sir, if the super profits-tax is put through and stepped up, industrial resources will be more at the disposal of the Government; industry will be on a better footing. I therefore appeal to the Prime Minister. Let him receive the delegations of the goldsmiths. Yesterday, Sir, a Calcutta paper contained the most heart-rending news. One goldsmith, Mr. Sunil Sirkar, took nitric acid on the 17th of March and put an end to his life. He was unemployed as a result of certain features of the Gold Control Order and he could not find employment, and he waited patiently. But then he thought that better redemption of himself would be by putting an end to his life. That is what we see, and we are told 100 goldsmiths in the country have committed suicide by now. On the one

[Shri Bhupesh Gupta]
 hand we find that these people subjected to such terrific pressure in this kind of thing are committing suicide, are putting an end to their lives. Now, Mr. Sunil Sirkar has a family which he could not support. On the other hand we find gentlemen of the high money coming to Delhi and meeting Ministers and others including the Prime Minister to get things scaled down, getting the impost on them reduced. Now we have to choose. Where do we stand? Do we stand with the cause of Mr. Sunil Sirkar, or do we stand with what the big money, Mr. Tata and others are doing? Mr. Chairman, I appeal to the Government again. Let them receive deputations of the goldsmiths and others and see how they can save them; a craft which has developed over generations is today threatened and, what is more, the human aspect of it should be borne in mind. So many people have been thrown suddenly unemployed without any moorings and bearings in life. Everything before them is dark and despair. Is it not our duty to ask the State Governments . . .

SHRI C. D. PANDE: Are you against the gold policy of the Government?

SHRI BHUPESH GUPTA: You see, Mr. Pande is unwitting sometimes. Have I said that I am opposing the gold policy of the Government?

MR. CHAIRMAN: He was just making sure.

12 Noon

SHRI BHUPESH GUPTA: I thought that Dr. Pande having been educated in Paris and England and also having lived in prison with Pandit Nehru would certainly have greater intelligence than he has. He is an intelligent person. I should have thought so. I know it is not the gold policy. You think of how you can meet this situation, give relief to these people, give them the assurance that their lives are not going to be ruined. Give the assurance to the goldsmiths that they do not have to put an end to their

lives thinking that this is the only way out of the present impasse and situation. Is it not possible for the Government to do so?

Finally, I would only like to point out before I end that in this matter—because you will always like factual things—here I found out from the answer given by the Minister—documentation is necessary—that the gold collected, manufactured articles other than ornaments collected up to 2nd February is only 1,98,367 gms. If you add the collections to it of other forms of non-ornament gold, then it comes to about 4,25,700 gms. If you see Hyderabad and some other places or take West Bengal where people are committing suicide, what is the collection in the West Bengal—Calcutta—circle? How much have you collected? Do you know? In one place we have collected manufactured articles other than ornaments, 17 gms. Multiply it by Rs. 50 or so and you get the value. All other forms of non-ornament gold you have got 980 gms. No collection from Calcutta. Yet everybody knows that in Calcutta there is bullion, of non-ornament gold, lying with the rich people, with multi-millionaires and so on and collection is not made in Calcutta.

SHRI LOKANATH MISRA (Orissa): Because they are under your influence.

SHRI BHUPESH GUPTA: That is called Ganatantra intelligence.

MR. CHAIRMAN: You mean to say that people with gold are under his influence?

SHRI BHUPESH GUPTA: It can never be. That intelligence is impervious to my logic. He says that they are under my influence, that millionaires of Calcutta are under my influence. I think Mr. Patnaik should have given Orissa a little more intelligence in these quarters. This is the position. How much has been found from the middle or central part of India from Rajasthan and other places? Beyond

this sum, only very little gold has come. There I would ask Mr. Pande to implement the gold policy, to find out the hoarded gold lying with the richer sections of the people, multi-millionaires and princes and save the goldsmiths from this kind of suicide and so on. I plead with the House again as I had done before, that as far as the case of goldsmiths is concerned, let us not go into long discussions on the gold policy. We have supported it. There are favourable features, good features of the gold policy and we stand by them but certainly the time has come to seriously ponder and the suicides are eloquent reminders to the nation and the Parliament that their interests should be looked after with sympathetic care, compassion and vision. This is all that I appeal to this House and through this House, to the Government.

SHRI PANNALAL SARAOGI: Mr. Bhupesh Gupta has really got a habit of wandering from one point to another without really seriously trying to understand anything. What does he know about business and industrial development? He professes to make speeches on that subject also. The Chinese aggression should open the eyes of the entire nation for all time to come.

SHRI BHUPESH GUPTA: To which point he is going from gold?

SHRI PANNALAL SARAOGI: He has spoken enough. The Chinese aggression should open the eyes of the nation for all time to come. It looks as if we are on the threshold of a long and hazardous journey, pitted as we are against an enemy who is not only extremely powerful but frightfully deceitful also. Never in the course of our history this thing was more true than today that to maintain the dignity and honour of our country is to ensure a proper co-ordination between the growing claims of defence and industrial development of the country because defence and industrial development are . . .

SHRI BHUPESH GUPTA: And go to Sikkim for the marriage . . .

SHRI PANNALAL SARAOGI: WHI you please sit down?

MR. CHAIRMAN: Mr. Saraogi, you should not address him like that.

SHRI PANNALAL SARAOGI: I did not interrupt him when he was speaking . . .

MR. CHAIRMAN: There were interruptions to his speech. He has a loud voice.

SHRI PANNALAL SARAOGI: I am very sorry, Sir, but I was trying to say this that because defence and industrial development are two facets of the same problem of the maximum utilisation of all the available resources of the country. So when I made that suggestion, I was positively certain that it is meet and proper that every sector of the country should be made to pay to the utmost of its capacity in order that the country should be strengthened to repel the Chinese aggression but when I made that suggestion, I sincerely felt that the standard limit of 6 per cent. was not going to be raised to 20 per cent, there were serious objections from every quarter that industrial development is bound to suffer. There have been instances when collaborators and foreign investors have backed out because of the levy of the super profits-tax. It was in that very connection that I tried to make this suggestion that the Government revenue will not suffer. It will be at least Rs. 40 crores and the criticisms will be met. I am positive that whatever suggestion I have given is with the best of intentions. Mr. J. R. D. Tata and other great industrialists have done much better service than Mr. Gupta has done to the country. These Communists have ruined the country and Mr. Tata and the great industrialists who met the Prime Minister are the people who have put the industrial development in the map of the country and they are

[Shri Pannalal Saraogi.]
 assisting the country more than these parties have done.

SHRI BHUPESH GUPTA: And put Mr. Saraogi in the Rajya Sabha. Why not add that?

SHRI CHANDRA SHEKHAR: Mr. Chairman, I want to give a political warning to our Finance Minister. I remember one instance. Trotsky was writing the biography of Stalin. In the introductory part of that biography, Trotsky has written a remarkable thing. He has written that an orator can change the society because he has the power to move the masses but a writer is greater than an orator because a writer can produce so many orators; but unfortunately in the course of human history, he said. 'Stalin was neither an orator nor a writer, he was a conspirator and a conspirator changed the course of history.' This is the warning of the **present day human history** and that warning should be taken by the Finance Minister of India. What did Stalin do? Trotsky has very clearly stated in his memoirs that in the name of Bolshevism, in the name of theory, in the name of development of the Soviet Union, he took all the steps but Stalin hit behind the back and he went to the people against whom Trotsky took action, and said that he was putting balm on their injuries. By doing that, a day came when Trotsky was isolated and Stalin became the dictator of the Soviet Union. Those ideological sons of Stalin are surviving in all parts of the world and in this country also. In this context, I shall like to warn the Finance Minister that considering the matter of super profits-tax or considering the question of the rehabilitation of goldsmiths, he must take into consideration that these conspiratorial sons of Stalin, are working in our country also and history may change the course if we are not going to heed to the aspirations of the people, of the common masses, who are really suffering from hunger, poverty and illiteracy. This is all.

SHRI BHUPESH GUPTA: I must congratulate the Leader of the Party who has produced such a person.

SHRI GANGA SHARAN SINHA (Bihar): I am proud of him.

SHRI B. R. BHAGAT: I have nothing more to add.

MR. CHAIRMAN: The question is:

"That the Bill be returned."

The motion was adopted.

POINT OF ORDER RE A MEMBER'S PERSONAL REFERENCE TO ANOTHER MEMBER

DR. SHRIMATI SEETA PARMANAND (Madhya Pradesh): Mr. Chairman, before you proceed, I want to rise on a point of order. In the proceedings of yesterday's debate, when I requested the Home Minister to make a note how confidential documents were referred to again and again on the floor of the House and that he should take some action so that during this emergency, defence secrets also do not leak out, Mr. Bhupesh Gupta went on interrupting—it may be out of joke but on the floor of the House such false statements should not be made and I read in the record on page 126 of the Rajya Sabha, cyclostyled copy of the debate—he said: "She supplied me the document, I gave the information." This is an utterly false statement, though made in light humour and I hope Mr. Gupta owes an explanation to say that he should not have made such a statement.

SHRI BHUPESH GUPTA (West Bengal): Somebody gave it to me and I thought Dr. Parmanand liked me so much that she might as well be the person who supplied it. I am sorry if she did not.

MR. CHAIRMAN: You mean by "she" you did not mean her. He did not mean you.